

of course, extending unemployment insurance. It is retroactive to anybody who has lost their job back to March.

I remember just after the attacks in September, going back home to Albuquerque and talking to people there and I always ask now, I say, how are things going, how is business going? They were laying people off at the rental car companies. Tourism and travel has been really decimated by these attacks. It is not just large airlines. It is the hotels and the motels and the rental car companies, all of those folks who lost their jobs already, even back to March when, technically, the recession started.

They are going to be eligible for extended unemployment benefits if they cannot find a job and we are going to have to accept that in this time of a slowdown, it is probably going to be a longer time period between the time one gets laid off and when one starts the new job.

I know the gentleman from Arizona has worked hard on the Committee on Ways and Means, as have other Members of this House. The leadership has really come up with a very good compromise proposal. I think the House just needs to pass it. We need to move on.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield first to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will just make a quick point. Very quickly, picking up on what the gentlewoman from New Mexico said, this bill incorporates a variety of different opportunities in what we call tax-slaying extensions, taking advantage of opportunities and credits already existing in terms of research and development. The gentleman mentioned welfare to work and work opportunity tax credit. I would be remiss on behalf of my constituency if I did not mention the extension for the first Americans, for native Americans, who find themselves, as we understand, so often left behind.

Now, as we seek to revitalize tribal economies and economic opportunities there, there are provisions that have been included in this bill that are good for Oklahoma, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) has been an unfailing champion on this. We are pleased to include that in this bill so that no American is left behind. Opportunities are there for all. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will yield to gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate, the theme here is: would you rather have a paycheck or an unemployment check? Would you rather be independent or dependent?

These tax credits, these investment credits create jobs. Yesterday I was with a friend of mine named Kevin Jackson. He owns a company called

Envirovac. He has about 400 people on his payroll. They go into factories and do maintenance. He says every factory that they visit right now is flat because they are laying off people in this recession. This jobs creation-economic stimulus package will turn it around. Again, we are talking about real people and real faces, because we know these folks. They would rather be independent than dependent on an unemployment check. They want a job.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) for the balance of the time.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, people are hurting in America. We have lost 700,000 jobs in this country since September 11. We need to help people across to the next job. We need to help keep the jobs that we have and help find new jobs in this economy. The way we are going to do it is by giving small business the tools they need to invest in creating new jobs, restore confidence in capital markets, put money in the pockets of consumers immediately, both low-income and middle income Americans, and we are also going to help people over the hump with health care and unemployment insurance to make sure that those who are hurting can make it by. We want this recession to be as short and as shallow as we possibly can make it. In the House, we will act.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will yield, I know the gentleman's time is about to expire, but I did want to say that it is imperative that this House acts and, hopefully, the Senate follows as well, to make this recession short and shallow, as the gentlewoman from New Mexico said, but also to help the unemployed.

What is really excellent about this new stimulus bill is that for the first time, it provides assistance in purchasing health insurance for the unemployed. America has never done that before. This is a first. Only this bill offers the same assistance to everyone. If one works for an employer who provided what is called COBRA benefits, one can use their 50 percent benefit, or their 60 percent benefit now, for COBRA benefits. But most people work for small employers and small employers are not covered by COBRA, so if one works for a small employer and is laid off, the old bill and the bill of the other party will not help them. This will give them a 60 percent premium subsidy, whether they buy their own health insurance, whether their employee is COBRA-covered or not. Everyone will be treated the same. All unemployed will get help, with health insurance benefits as well as extended unemployment benefits. I thank the gentleman for yielding his precious time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for her good work on this bill, and I thank all of my colleagues for participating in this Special Order.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). The Chair would again remind all Members that it is not in order to characterize Senate action or inaction, to encourage action by the Senate, or refer to individual members of the Senate, except with respect to sponsorship of bills or amendments.

#### AMERICA NEEDS BIPARTISAN STIMULUS PACKAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do plan initially to respond to some of the comments that were made by my Republican colleagues about the potential stimulus bill that I gather we may see on the House Floor as early as tomorrow. Regardless of the substance of the stimulus package that the Republican leadership may bring up tomorrow, I think the bottom line is, and everyone needs to know, that it is going nowhere. They are fully aware of the fact that it is going nowhere. I think what we are going to see tomorrow, and I think it is very unfortunate, is basically a replay of what happened a couple of months ago when, in the aftermath of September 11 and the World Trade Center and Pentagon tragedies, there was an effort in the few weeks afterwards, because of the realization of the impact on the economy and because the recession was only, if you will, accelerated by the events on September 11, there was a recognition that we needed to do a stimulus package to get the economy going again, and that the only way to achieve that, given that we have a divided government, one body Democrat, one body Republican majority, that we needed to work across party lines and to bring the House and the Senate together.

So there was sort of understanding that we would all sit down and work on a stimulus package together, Democrats and Republicans together, Senate and House together, as well as with the President.

□ 2115

But unfortunately, very quickly that dissolved because the House Republican leadership wanted to pass their own version of a stimulus package and was not willing to work with the

Democrats in the House or with the other body. A bill was passed very narrowly, I think it passed by one or two votes here in the House, and of course it was never taken up in the other body. There was no meeting of the minds and no effort to try to come to any kind of accommodation across party lines.

I would suggest, having been here, I guess, 12 years, that anything like that, where one party which is in the majority tries to simply shove down their throats, if you will, a bill that the other party cannot stomach because they think it is the wrong way to go, is doomed to failure.

Every one of my colleagues who spoke on the other side of the aisle just in the last hour knows very well that if all they do tomorrow is bring up another Republican leadership bill that has not been negotiated with the Democrats, which this one has not been, then the end result is failure. The end result is that that bill will go nowhere, no stimulus package will pass; and we will go home within the next few days having accomplished nothing for the American people.

The very fact that they are even talking about this bill means that my Republican colleagues in the Republican leadership have basically decided that they do not care to pass a stimulus package. So when they suggest that they are going to try to help the unemployed, that they are going to provide health benefits, that they are going to do things for corporate America that are going to help create jobs, the very fact that they are bringing a bill to the floor that was not negotiated on a bipartisan basis means that those things will never happen; and it is very unfortunate.

It is also very unfortunate that they keep talking about passing another bill when the first one was doomed to failure; and the second one will be, as well, because it is really nothing more than a hoax on the American people. The American people will not see a stimulus package. The best thing they could do would be to go back and sit down and talk to the Democrats in the other body, in the Senate, and try to come to some sort of accommodation, rather than just bashing and bashing and hammering as this goes on.

I want to talk a little bit about why the Democrats feel that this Republican stimulus package is really nothing different from the previous one and will not help, even if it did pass, to stimulate the economy.

Understand, on the one hand I am saying tonight that this bill that they are going to bring up tomorrow, if it is brought up, cannot pass; so it is hopeless from the beginning, cannot pass both houses and be signed into law. But even if it did pass, it would not do anything to stimulate the economy. That is what we are really trying to do here,

stimulate the economy on a short-term basis to have the recession be over.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the Democratic alternative to the original Republican bill to give my colleagues the flavor, if you will, of what the Democrats would like to see and why the Democratic alternative would serve the purpose of helping displaced workers get unemployment compensation, get health benefits, and stimulate the economy.

The original House bill that I was talking about, the original Republican bill that was doomed to failure, passed the House on October 24, almost 2 months ago. It passed strictly on party lines, 216 to 214. This is the Republican stimulus package. What it called for, and this one, as well, that they intend to bring up tomorrow calls for, is essentially tax cuts for big businesses and the wealthy.

Now, how do we get the economy going again if all we do is give big tax breaks to big corporations and wealthy people? They do not have any obligation, wealthy persons do not have any obligation to spend that money. They may just put it in the bank. They may put it in stocks or do something else. They are not immediately going to spend the money, which is what is needed to stimulate the economy.

The way the economy is stimulated is when people have to spend money because they have to buy food or have to pay their rent or whatever they have to do. Generally speaking, our middle-class people or even poor people, they go out and spend money, they shop, and the economy gets going again.

This notion that we are just going to give these big tax breaks to big corporations, again, that has no stimulative effect. They do not necessarily have to take that money and invest it in new equipment or in new jobs or new production of any sort. I would venture to say that many of them probably would not.

So the whole premise of the Republican proposal, which is essentially tax cuts for big businesses and the wealthy, really does not help anything. It does not help stimulate the economy, and it certainly does not help with those workers who have been displaced and are looking for a job.

The Democratic alternative that we have proposed back in October and that we still have been pushing for today by contrast would provide workers with extended unemployment benefits, health coverage, and tax breaks for low- and moderate-income Americans.

If I could use my home State, I could say that I have some statistics, if you will, from the U.S. Department of Labor with regard to New Jersey. They say that an estimated 361,942, and I guess it is not really an estimate but it is an exact figure, New Jersey residents will apply for unemployment benefits over the next year, and almost half of

those, 166,493, will see those benefits expire during that same period.

Nationally, half of the unemployed people do not currently qualify for unemployment benefits, and the vast majority cannot afford health coverage under our current system.

Let me get a little more specific about what the Democrats have been talking about. In terms of unemployment compensation, individuals who exhaust their 26-week eligibility for State unemployment would be eligible for an additional 52 weeks of cash payment funded entirely by the Federal Government. Individuals who do not meet their States' requirements for unemployment insurance, in other words, part-time workers, would receive 56 weeks of federally financed unemployment insurance. Members can see how that would make a difference for a lot of people.

With regard to health care benefits, under the Democratic proposal, the Federal Government would fully reimburse eligible individuals for their COBRA premiums. Individuals who do not qualify for COBRA and are otherwise uninsured would be eligible for Medicaid, with the Federal Government covering 100 percent of the premiums. These benefits would last for a maximum of 18 months.

Now, the Democrats keep talking about the Federal Government paying these costs, because we have to understand that State governments are strapped. Many of them face deficits. They are not in a position to be able to pay for these things, which is why the Federal Government is proposing to do it.

The Democrats also have rebate checks for low- and moderate-income workers who did not qualify for the rebate checks issued earlier this year under President Bush's tax cut.

Now, I maintain that President Bush's tax cut from maybe 6 months ago is the major reason why we are now in a deficit situation, and I do not believe that accelerating those tax cuts is really going to make a difference in terms of stimulating the economy. That is essentially what the Republican leadership is proposing.

Under the Democratic proposal, these low- and moderate-income workers who did not qualify for the rebate checks issued earlier this year under President Bush's tax cut would receive a one-time payment of up to \$300 for single people and \$600 for married couples.

There are many other aspects of the Democratic proposal, but I just wanted to key into the fact that rather than giving these big corporate tax breaks and tax breaks to the wealthy, we are trying to put some money into the hands of low- and moderate-income people who will go out and spend the money and stimulate the economy; the same with the unemployment compensation, and the same with the

health benefits. Even providing health insurance and extended COBRA and Medicaid stimulates the economy because that money is now being spent on health care.

Mr. Speaker, I always worry when I am on the floor of the House and I do these Special Orders that someone is going to say, he is just giving the Democratic line, and that is what all the Democrats are saying, but why should I believe it?

I would like to back up what I am saying, contrasting what the Democrats are proposing to do versus the Republicans with some of the editorial comments that we have been getting from some of the leading newspapers around the country. This one is particularly appropriate. This is from the Los Angeles Times, and it is in today's paper.

Just to give some highlights of what this editorial says, and this is an editorial, as I say, from today's Los Angeles Times, it talks about some of the Republican tax breaks that are proposed not in the previous Republican bill that passed the House, but the one that my colleagues are talking about possibly bringing up tomorrow. So we are talking about the current bill, not the previous bill.

What this editorial says in the Los Angeles Times, it first of all talks about the retroactive corporate tax cuts. The Republican leadership has been pushing not only these big corporate tax cuts, but making them retroactive, so that the companies would get tax money back, money back from taxes they paid years ago.

Well, it says in the editorial, and I quote: "House GOP leaders such as Dick Armey seem giddy thinking about the pleasure that corporations would have upon receiving a refund of what they paid under the 'alternative minimum tax' over the last 15 years." They are now getting refunds for taxes paid over 15 years.

"The proposal would hand out millions to corporations such as General Motors and Ford for doing nothing. Even Enron, which recently went broke after deceiving investors and workers, could conceivably get this windfall. Whopping corporate tax deductions."

Now, the other thing, of course, the Republicans are saying is that they want to accelerate the drop in income tax rates for higher-income people.

"Some Republicans hope to make the season bright," and they are talking about the Christmas season in the editorial, "by cutting the 27 percent rate to 25 percent in 2002. But this gift would benefit the top one-fourth of taxpayers and cost \$54 billion in lost revenue over 10 years. Where's the stimulus in giving a break to upper-income folks who are unlikely to use it to buy extra groceries?"

Further on the editorial says, and I think some of my colleagues even men-

tioned this on the other side in the last hour, "A 30 percent 3-year tax write-off on new equipment. The Bush administration wants to include this, although multiyear tax cuts have little immediate stimulus effect."

Of course, we would like to see some kind of tax break for new equipment, but we are talking about 3 years. Yet I heard some of my colleagues on the other side talk about how they want this to be immediate. How is it immediate with a 3-year write-off on new equipment?

The last thing the editorial says, it talks about "A Trojan horse 2-year voucher-credit health care plan. The White House is offering a scheme that would give displaced workers a temporary tax credit for health care. But what Representative WILLIAM M. THOMAS (R-Bakersfield)," the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, "and other congressional Republicans really want is to use the voucher idea as a wedge in replacing current employer-paid health care with a free market approach similar to the use of vouchers for education."

So what are we seeing here? We are seeing some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, some of the Republicans, not just trying to extend COBRA or provide Medicaid for those displaced workers, which is the easiest thing to do and what the Democrats want, but some sort of tax credit or voucher.

Most of the people who are now out of work will not even be able to use that tax credit. It is not going to get them health insurance; but it is a sort of voucher, if you will, that has the potential of getting people out or actually hurting the current system, where most employees get their health insurance through their employer and switching to some sort of free market system, which I do not think is going to work and is probably only going to line the pockets of some insurance company.

I hate to be so dramatic about it, but this is what we are facing. Again, one could argue that there is no point in even talking about any of this anyway, because they have no intention of passing anything. They are just going to pass it in the House, and it will die in the other body. I can talk here all night about how bad this proposal is, only because I want to counteract all the things that were said by my colleagues an hour before.

But I go back to what I originally said, that their real intention is to do nothing, because everyone knows that this bill is going nowhere.

Let me just talk a little bit about another aspect of the Republican proposal which is so different than the Democrats that is very scary, that is, that it is not paid for.

Now, we know that we are in a deficit situation now. In the 8 years under the

Democratic President, and I know people say we certainly have to give President Bush the benefit of the doubt because he has been doing such a great job in dealing with the war, and actually very successful in going against terrorism and the al Qaeda network. I am very happy about all that.

But when it comes to these domestic issues, it is very scary what is really happening. Because of the Republican tax cut that took place about 6 months ago, we are now in a deficit, which has been aggravated by what happened on September 11 because of the recession and because of what comes from the recession, which is less income to the Federal Government.

The least that the Republicans could do when they put forth a stimulus package is come up with a plan that is short term and that is paid for, or if it is not paid for immediately, makes a way to pay for it fairly quickly over the next few years so we do not deepen the deficit, because we do not want to continue to have a deficit situation. It is a huge drag on the economy and could prolong the recession, rather than stimulating the economy.

□ 2130

Well, the problem with the Republican bill and, again, I am talking about the one they plan to bring to the floor tomorrow, is that it is pretty much paid for out of Medicare. It either increases the national debt or it is paid for out of Medicare and Social Security.

So what you have is it is either going to increase the debt or it is going to take money from the Medicare and Social Security trust fund. And it is almost the same thing as increasing the debt, because we know that those trust funds are at some point in the next 20, 30 years going to run out of money, and we have been talking about trying to find ways of making Medicare and Social Security solvent over the long term. All the Republican leadership is going to do with this bill is increase the Federal debt and aggravate the solvency problem for Medicare and Social Security by taking the money away from there.

The cost of the Republican stimulus package, again, the one that is coming up tomorrow, would approach \$200 billion over the next 10 years when you take into account debt service cost. Even without enactment of the stimulus bill, the government will be in overall deficit throughout the entire first term of President Bush. And with the enactment of this new stimulus bill, the government will continue to raid the Social Security and Medicare trust funds for the foreseeable future long after the current recession is estimated to end.

The Democrats, of course, have said that that is not acceptable. If you are going to do a stimulus package which



is going to have a short term impact on the economy, then do not give us a long term impact on the economy by increasing the debt or making the solvency problem for Social Security and Medicare even worse.

I wanted to talk a little bit about this health tax credit aspect of the Republican bill that is likely to come up tomorrow because, again, I think it is a very scary thing. I have always said over and over again, let us not let ideology get in the way of doing something practical to help the American people. The stimulus bill should be that. It should be nothing more than a practical bipartisan effort to do something to restore the economy in the short run. And to try to load it up with some sort of ideological voucher system for health care that would break the traditional health care system primarily financed through employers is basically grafting some sort of right wing Republican ideology on a stimulus package in a way that is totally wrong given what we are trying to accomplish here.

I do not know if I can get into all the details of it tonight, but I want to just explain a little bit about what this health care tax credit that the Republicans are proposing would actually do. What they are doing is creating an individual tax credit for use in purchasing either COBRA or individual market health insurance policies. So unlike the Democrats, they are not just going to pay for your COBRA benefits and put you or make you eligible for Medicaid with Federal funds. They are giving you some sort of credit for voucher, if you will, that you can use to help pay for COBRA or go out into the individual market and try to buy health insurance policy.

Now, anybody who has ever tried to go out into the individual market and try to find a policy knows that it is a horrendous situation. The costs are incredible. The tax credit is not going to help you. Unless you are going to buy some basically rotten policy that is going to give you very little coverage, and then what you will have is the government money through the tax credit being used to give people a policy that essentially is not really very helpful to them and does not provide them the kind of benefit package that would be useful to them, if they can even find it.

Again, I would say, Mr. Speaker, they are not even going to find this policy, but if they did it would be a lousy policy. Now, just to give you some research, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office did some research and they indicated that few people would actually benefit from this Republican health care tax credit. According to the CBO, up to 9 million displaced workers would receive relief under the Democratic plan; 5.1 million would be covered by COBRA, about 80 percent, and up to 3.8 million under

Medicaid. But the same estimate shows that of the Republican style tax credit, only 3.35 million individuals would be eligible for this benefit, less than a majority.

So when my Republican colleagues in the last hour said we are going to provide all this health care coverage, not only do we have the danger of this breaking the system, the traditional system and this voucher, but it is not even going to provide coverage to the majority of the people that would need it and who are unemployed.

I just cannot believe essentially what they are up to with this scheme. If you think about it, as Members of Congress we are getting an incredibly good health care coverage policy that is paid for by the Federal Government. The very Republican leaders who are talking about this voucher for health insurance, 75 percent of their health care coverage as Members of Congress is provided to them at taxpayers' expense.

The other thing that I think we are going to see here is that this kind of coverage that they are talking about that you might be able to get at individual market, a lot of it is probably going to go to HMO's. Because without a guaranteed minimum benefit package, which is what should be provided to make sure we get a decent health care plan, I think most of the people are going to end up with some kind of an HMO which limits what doctors they can get, limits what coverage they can get.

Again, I can talk all night about this and I do not know in some ways what the point is, because as much as I am trying to contrast the Republican plan with the Democratic proposals, I really want to stress over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that they are bringing up tomorrow a Republican plan without input from the Democrats and without input from the Senate, essentially means that we will have not planned. Their proposal is due to failure.

I do not want to go into this any more because I hopefully have made the point, but what I would say to my colleagues is, regardless of whether you like what the Democrats propose or you like what the Republicans propose, the most important thing is to have the negotiations and sit down and try to come up with an accommodation and do not come here on the floor of the House and blame the other body and say, oh, the other body, the Senate better take this up because if they do not, the blame falls on them.

Well, clearly, if you put something together that is not done in a bipartisan basis, it is going nowhere. And I am not going to sit here and accept the notion that somehow this Senate is going to be blamed because they do not pass this Republican package. This is not a Republican package that is aimed

to accomplish anything. It is just being done for some sort of publicity stunt.

Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to end my discussion tonight or my response if you will to my Republican colleagues on the economic stimulus package. I probably will be back again, hopefully not. Hopefully we will pass something. But we will probably be back again talking about that another time, tomorrow or the next day as we progress here in these last few days before the holidays.

#### EVIDENCE OF TERRORISM BY PAKISTANI-BASED GROUPS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I did want to take 5 minutes of my time this evening to talk about a totally different issue, and that is my concern over what is happening and what has been happening in India with the terrorist attacks that have been taking place in India and, most notably, with the attack on the Indian parliament that took place last week.

I mention this because in the effort to fight the war against terrorism, President Bush has made it clear many times that this is a battle with many fronts. It has a homeland security element. It has an overseas element. And of course it is primarily been manifested overseas in the war against the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan. But we know that al Qaeda has cells in a lot of different countries and we know that a lot of these terrorists groups are linked. And so the President has made clear this is not a battle that will be limited to Afghanistan or that is going to be limited to this year. It is going to go on for many years and it is going to manifest itself in many ways.

But one of the disappointing aspects of it all from my perspective is that I have watched Pakistan help the United States in a significant way in the war against the Taliban in Afghanistan, and against al Qaeda in Afghanistan; yet at the same time I see that same Pakistani government continuing its effort to back terrorists who inflict pain and death and injury on Indian citizens, particularly in Kashmir. But even more so, of course, now it has actually gotten to the stage where attacks were made on the parliament, the symbol of Indian democracy.

My point tonight, and I have said it many times, is that if Pakistan, like any country, really wants to be sincere in fighting the war against terrorists, they cannot limit it to Afghanistan. They have to also not support terrorist activities against India or any other country.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last Thursday, we learned about a horrific terrorist attack on the parliament of India in New Delhi. Reports indicate that the terrorist attackers died during the attack but, unfortunately, eight people, including guards and workers, were killed and at least 17 people were injured at the hands of the suicide

bomber and the other assailants equipped with grenades and guns that attacked the Indian parliament.

India has conducted intense investigations since the attack and has obtained evidence that two Pakistani based militant groups, I am not sure I can pronounce them, Mr. Speaker, but I will try, Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkar-e-Taiba are responsible for the attack.

Indian evidence also makes it clear that these groups received directives from Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence or ISI. Mr. Speaker, this comes as no surprise to anyone who has been following these two groups' history of cross-border terrorism in Kashmir, and I have confidence that India's evidence is both strong and accurate against the two terrorist groups.

I have criticized and denounced the actions of these groups many times on the floor of the House. The most recent incident I have found to be appalling was the suicide car bomb attack on the Jammu and Kashmir State Assembly on October 1. Jaish-e-Mohammed came forward and took credit for that crime which they later revoke, and I have encouraged President Bush to add this group to the list of terrorist organizations whose financial assets would be frozen. Although this group has been placed on the list, Pakistan continues to allow them to operate with no financial restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that General Musharraf, the President of Pakistan, has been willing to help the U.S. in the global fight against terrorism, however, it is clear that Pakistan has deep-rooted and intricate ties to the Taliban, al Qaeda and, most importantly, the terrorist groups operating in Kashmir and now in New Delhi.

India has requested that General Musharraf eliminate the terrorist capabilities of both Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkar-e-Taiba. This would consist of Pakistan shutting down these groups operations, discontinuing moral and logistical support, arresting the leaders, and once and for all freezing their financial assets.

I believe that India has every right to make these requests and I have requested today in a letter to President Bush that the U.S. make the same demand of General Musharraf, to put an end to Pakistan's support and tolerance of these terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, the attack on the world's largest democracy and the Indian people must be answered with punitive action. The U.S. administration must push General Musharraf harder to arrest the leaders of Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkar-e-Taiba. In addition, he must follow through and shut down all terrorist camps operating in Pakistan and all jihadi schools that indoctrinate terrorism from children. Not only is this in the interest of India, it would equally benefit Pakistan as well.

It has been made clear that terrorist groups operating in Pakistan have links to Osama bin Laden and the al Qaeda terrorist networks. And I believe that efforts to eliminate these terrorist groups is also in the best interest of the United States.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I make these comments not because what I think is going to hurt Pakistan but by what I think is going to help Pakistan. In the same way that General Musharraf has come to the conclusion or came to the conclusion after September 11 that aiding the United States in the war against the Taliban and against al Qaeda would ultimately be helpful to Pakistan because of the terrorist activities that take place within Pakistan, I think the same thing is true of these groups that operate and get support from Pakistan and attack India.

In the long run, all of these terrorist groups have to be eradicated and Pakistan must deal with the situation and try to suppress the terrorism, not only when it is geared towards the United States or Afghanistan, but also when it is geared towards Kashmir and India.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0825

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m., legislative day of Tuesday, December 18, 2001.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-343) on the resolution (H. Res. 318) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privi-

leged report (Rept. No. 107-344) on the resolution (H. Res. 319) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEASURE TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the notice requirements of House Resolution 314, I now set the following measure to be considered under suspension of the rules on Wednesday, December 19, 2001: S. 1202.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3061

Mr. REGULA submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3061) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes":

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 107-342)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3061) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

*That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

##### TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

*For necessary expenses of the Workforce Investment Act, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Workforce Investment Act; the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act; and the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; \$3,167,282,000 plus reimbursements, of which \$1,779,342,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003; of which \$1,353,065,000 is available for obligation for the period April 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003, including \$1,127,965,000 to carry out chapter 4 of the Workforce Investment Act and \$225,100,000 to carry out section 169 of such Act; and of which \$3,500,000 is available for obligation October 1, 2001 until expended for carrying*